Evaluation Criterion	Weight
This criterion relates to the institution's commitment to the project and the adequacy of institutional resources available to carry out the project.	
(1) Institutional commitment—Is there evidence to substantiate that the institution attributes a high- priority to the project, that the project is linked to the achievement of the institution's long-term goals, that it will help satisfy the institution's high-priority objectives, or that the project is sup- ported by the institution's strategic plans?.	10 points.
(2) Institutional resources—Will the project have adequate support to carry out the proposed activities? Will the project have reasonable access to needed resources such as instructional instrumentation, facilities, computer services, library and other instruction support resources?.	10 points.
(d) Key personnel:	20 points.
This criterion relates to the number and qualifications of the key persons who will carry out the project. Are designated project personnel qualified to carry out a successful project? Are there sufficient numbers of personnel associated with the project to achieve the stated objectives and the anticipated outcomes?	
(e) Budget and cost-effectiveness:	
This criterion relates to the extent to which the total budget adequately supports the project and is cost- effective.	
(1) Budget—Is the budget request justifiable? Are costs reasonable and necessary? Will the total budget be adequate to carry out project activities? Are the source(s) and amount(s) of non-Fed- eral matching support clearly identified and appropriately documented? For a joint project pro- posal, is the shared budget explained clearly and in sufficient detail?.	10 points.
(2) Cost-effectiveness—Is the proposed project cost-effective? Does it demonstrate a creative use of limited resources, maximize educational value per dollar of USDA support, achieve economies of scale, leverage additional funds or have the potential to do so, focus expertise and activity on a targeted need area, or promote coalition building for current or future ventures?.	10 points.
(f) Overall quality of proposal:	10 points.
This criterion relates to the degree to which the proposal complies with the application guidelines and is of high quality. Is the proposal enhanced by its adherence to instructions (table of contents, organization, pagination, margin and font size, the 20-page limitation, appendices, etc.); accuracy of forms; clarity of budget narrative; well prepared vitae for all key personnel associated with the project; and presentation (are ideas effectively presented, clearly articulated, and thoroughly explained, etc.)?	

Subpart F—Supplementary Information

§ 3405.16 Access to peer review information.

After final decisions have been announced, CSREES will, upon request, inform the project director of the reasons for its decision on a proposal. Verbatim copies of summary reviews, not including the identity of the peer reviewers, will be made available to respective project directors upon specific request.

§ 3405.17 Grant awards.

(a) General. Within the limit of funds available for such purpose, the authorized departmental officer shall make project grants to those responsible, eligible applicants whose proposals are judged most meritorious in the announced targeted need areas under the evaluation criteria and procedures set forth in this part. The beginning of the project period shall be no later than September 30 of the Federal fiscal year in which the project is approved for support. All funds granted under this part shall be expended solely for the

purpose for which the funds are granted in accordance with the approved application and budget, the regulations of this part, the terms and conditions of the award, the applicable Federal cost principles, and the Department's Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations (7 CFR part 3019).

(b) Organizational management information. Specific management information relating to a proposing institution shall be submitted on a one-time basis prior to the award of a project grant identified under this part if such information has not been provided previously under this or another program for which the sponsoring agency is responsible. Copies of the forms used to fulfill this requirement will be sent to the proposing institution by the sponsoring agency as part of the pre-award process.

- (c) Notice of grant award. The grant award document shall include at a minimum the following:
- (1) Legal name and address of performing organization.
- (2) Title of project.